

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief- Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

July 2, 2008

(Date of Deposit)

Russell E. Fowler II

Name of person mailing Document or Fee

Signature

July 2, 2008

Date of Signature

Re:

Application of:

Keenan, Jr. et al.

Serial No.:

10/770,351

Filed:

February 2, 2004

For:

Method and Device for Upgrading a

Building Control System

Group Art Unit:

2174

Confirmation No.:

7660

Examiner:

Steven Paul Sax

Our Docket No.:

2003P01392US01 (1867-0042)

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT

APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated June 2, 2008 for the above-identified patent application, please find below the replacement section that contains the complete Status of Amendments section.

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Applicants filed a Response to Office Action dated May 11, 2007 ("First Response") responsive to an Office Action dated January 11, 2007. The First Response included an amendment to claims 1 and 6, cancellation of claims 10-15, and a new claim 17. These amendments were entered by the examiner. A Final Office Action ("First Final Action") dated August 7, 2007 was designated by the Examiner to be responsive to the First Response. On November 5, 2007, attorney Russell E. Fowler II on behalf of the applicants and Examiner Steven P. Sax held a telephone interview ("Interview") which resulted in a new Office Action and deadline for response. The new Final Office Action ("Second Final Action") dated November 16, 2007 responsive to the Interview. Applicants filed a Response to Final Office Action ("Final Response") on January 11, 2008 that was responsive to the Second Final Action. The Final Response included an amendment to claim 17 to correct a typographical error and place the claim in better condition for allowance. The amendment to claim 17 was entered by the examiner. The Examiner then issued an Advisory Action dated February 8, 2008 ("Advisory Action") because the Final Response failed to bring the application into allowance. Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal dated March 17, 2008 ("Notice of Appeal") in response to the Advisory Action.

For all of the reasons set forth above and in the May 19, 2008 Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 and 16-17 are not unpatentably obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,124,397 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,558. As a consequence, the Board of Appeals is respectfully requested to reverse the rejection of these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell E. Fowler II

Attorney for Applicants

Attorney Registration No. 43,615

Maginot Moore & Beck

Chase Tower

111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109

Telephone: (317) 638-2922